



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ctt
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/700,129	02/23/2001	Takeshi Hagiwara	9319S-000166	1419

7590 08/13/2003

Harness Dickey & Pierce
PO Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DUNG T

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/700,129	HAGIWARA ET AL. <i>M</i>
Examiner	Art Unit	
Dung Nguyen	2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 February 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>4,8-10</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I (claims 1-13 and 14-21) in Paper No. 12 (filed 06/02/2003) is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that both group of claims are sufficiently related that an undue burden would not be placed upon maintaining both groups of claims in a single application. This is not found persuasive because, as stated in the previous office action (dated 05/06/2003), the invention in group I do not relate as to form a single general inventive concept since the method of group II would require a special technical feature (e.g., step of inspecting), classified in class 324 which is different from group I, classified in class 349. In other words, those inventions in group I and II are distinct and the search required for Group II is not required for Group I, so as restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Drawings

2. Figures 31a-b should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-6 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Applicants' submitted prior art, Toshimitsu et al., JP 63-092926.

Regarding claims 1 and 10-12, Toshimitsu et al. disclose a liquid crystal display (LCD) element (figure 1) comprising:

- . a pair of opposed substrates (1) via a seal member (5);
- . electrodes (2) formed inside are of the seal member (5);
- . an insulating film (3);
- . a terrace area (an outside part protruding from the seal member on which a semiconductor 9 formed) comprising wiring lines (portions extending from under the seal member) connected to the electrode (2), wherein at least a part of the wiring line is coated with an insulating film (3)(parts of the insulating film 3 extending from under the seal member) made of the material as the insulating film covered the electrodes (2);

- . an orientation film (4);
- . a liquid crystal layer (6).

Regarding claims 2-3, Toshimitsu et al. also disclose the wiring lines comprising an conductive connection member (portion not covered with the insulating film) electrically

connected to an integrative circuit (9) or a wiring member (10) through an anisotropic conductive film (7 and 8), wherein the edge of the anisotropic conductive film overlaps the insulating film (figure 1).

Regarding claims 4-6, since the method of manufacturing the device is merely a list of forming each component and each component must be formed to make the device, the method of manufacturing would be inherent to the device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7-9 and 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' submitted prior art, Toshimitsu et al., JP 63-092926, in view of Applicants' submitted prior art, Baeger, US Patent No. 4,483,591.

Regarding claims 7-8 and 14-21, Toshimitsu et al. disclose the claimed invention as described above except for the entire insulating film (i.e., overcoat layer) on the terrace area being covered with the orientation film as well as a positioning mark. Baeger does disclose an entire insulating film (5) on the terrace area (outside a sealant member 7) being covered with an orientation film (6). Baeger also disclose a positioning mark (10) where a connecting wire (8)

formed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the Toshimitsu et al. device in which an entire insulating film being covered by an orientation on the terrace area as shown by Baeger for the purpose of protection as well as to form a positng mark to define a connecting area.

Regarding claim 9, although the modification to the Toshimitsu et al. do not explicitly disclose the step of rubbing the orientation film, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use a method of rubbing for an orientation treatment in an LCD device in order to define an initially alignment for liquid crystal molecules.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-0423. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on 703-305-3492. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7726 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

DN
08/06/2003



Dung Nguyen
Patent Examiner
GAU 2871